

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

In re D.B, a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

B213807

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. VJ35763)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

D.B.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
S. Robert Ambrose, Temporary Judge. (Pursuant to Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21.) Affirmed.

Bruce G. Finebaum, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In March 2008, a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition was filed against then the minor, D.B., then 13 years old, alleging several offenses, among them residential burglary (Pen. Code, § 459) (count 1). On April 29, 2008, D.B. admitted the residential burglary allegation; and the court granted deferred entry of judgment, calculated a maximum term of confinement of six years and ordered him home on probation with specified conditions for not less than 12 months and not more than 36 months. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 790.) The remaining allegations were dismissed.

In August 2008, police detained then 14-year-old D.B. for possession of a firearm by a minor (Pen. Code, § 12101, subd. (a)(1)), having a concealed firearm in a vehicle (Pen. Code, § 12025, subd. (a)(1)), unlawfully driving or taking a vehicle (Veh. Code, § 10851, subd. (a)), and receiving stolen property (Pen. Code, § 496, subd. (a)). On August 12, 2008, the People filed a second Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition against him. D.B. denied the allegations.

On August 29, 2008, the juvenile court lifted the deferred entry of judgment in light of the second petition, sustained the previously admitted burglary allegation in the earlier petition, and scheduled a disposition hearing. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 793.) The court ordered D.B. to remain home on probation pending the new hearing, which was thereafter continued to the date of the jurisdiction hearing on the second petition.

The jurisdiction hearing on the second petition commenced on January 7, 2009. According to the People's evidence at the hearing, when D.B. was stopped for a traffic violation, he got out of the driver's seat, removed a handgun from his waistband and threw it in the backseat of the car. Police recovered the gun and discovered the registered owner of the car had not given anyone permission to drive or take the car.

D.B. testified in his defense and denied he was in possession of a handgun or was driving a car on the date of his arrest. He claimed police detained him in a park before seating him in a patrol car and taking him into custody without explanation.

At the conclusion of the jurisdiction hearing, the juvenile court found true the allegations D.B. was in possession of a firearm as a minor and had unlawfully driven or taken a vehicle and declared them to be felonies. The court dismissed the remaining counts. Thereafter, the court adjudged D.B. a ward of the court, imposed modified conditions of probation and ordered him into the short-term camp-community placement program. The court calculated maximum theoretical period of confinement on all sustained allegations in both petitions as seven years four months.

D.B. filed a timely notice of appeal challenging the jurisdiction order. We appointed counsel to represent D.B. on appeal.

After examination of the record counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On July 6, 2009, we advised D.B. he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date. We have examined the entire record and are satisfied D.B.'s attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The order under review is affirmed.

WOODS, Acting P.J.

We concur:

ZELON, J.

JACKSON, J.